FROM THE DIRECTOR ACQUISITION SUPPORT CENTER

I am pleased to announce that the Army's newest field operating agency, the Acquisition Support Center (ASC), has been realigned and is now located at Fort Belvoir, VA. Our internal reorganization and physical move have been challenging tasks, yet our goal remains the same—to serve you, the acquisition workforce. Be sure to access the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) home page at **http//asc.rdaisa.army.mil** for current contact information.

By the time you read this article, we will have celebrated the traditional annual AAC Ball. It was held Oct. 20, 2002, at the Holiday Inn in Old Town Alexandria, VA. This event again coincided with the annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army (AUSA). I hope that you had the opportunity to attend AUSA and to stop by the AAC booth to see the AAC exhibit "We've Got You Covered."

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Competitive Development Group (CDG) year group (YG) 2000 graduates and to welcome YG03 inductees to the CDG Program. The YG03 CDG Orientation was held Sept. 17-18, 2002, in the National Capital Region in Springfield, VA. Be sure to read the article on the YG03 CDG Orientation on Page 39 of this issue of *Army AL&T* magazine.

From the Army's leadership to the individual workforce member, everyone plays a critical role in Acquisition and Technology Workforce (A&TWF) transformation. Everyone plays a role in ensuring that workforce personnel are provided the right education, training, and experience opportunities to support the warfighter. I would like to direct your attention to Page 26 of this issue of *Army AL&T*, which features an article on the Army Acquisition Workforce Campaign Plan. The Acquisition Workforce Campaign Plan provides a strategic vision of how the workforce must transform to support the war on terrorism and enable Army transformation. Finally, I recommend you read the highly informative article on the Army Acquisition PM Workshop that begins on Page 28 of this magazine.

> **COL Mary Fuller**
> **Director**
> **Acquisition Support Center**

Ask The Acquisition Support Center

I am not sure if I am a member of the Acquisition and Technology Workforce (A&TWF). How can I find out?

The Army's Director of Acquisition Career Management (DACM) is responsible for the management and documentation of all Army A&TWF positions. The DACM has established an acquisition position list (APL) process to enable acquisition commands, program executive offices, and other acquisition organizations to identify civilian and military position requirements to include Active, Reserve, National Guard, and Army Medical Department components. Many sources are available to assist commanders in determining whether or not a position should be identified as A&TWF. These sources include the following, which were disseminated in conjunction with passage of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) of 1990:

*• The DOD acquisition career field templates found in DoD Regulation 5000.52-M, Acquisition Career Development Program (available online at **http://www.dtic.mil/whs/directives/corres/html/500052m.htm**); and*

• The Army implementing guidance associated with the revised "Packard" definition of A&TWF (July 2001).

Organizations submit their civilian acquisition position requirements to the DACM using the APL process. Each acquisition commander has a designated APL command point of contact (POC) who has the authority to submit requests to add, update, or delete positions from the approved APL list. The DACM approves all requests that pertain to civilian critical acquisition positions as well as all military positions. When a new position is approved and added to the APL list, a unique APL number is assigned to the position, primarily as a means to track the position. APL data are also used to report acquisition position information to higher headquarters and Congress as requested.

If your organization has identified your position as A&TWF, the various blocks included on Section I of your Acquisition Career Record Brief (ACRB) would be filled with your current acquisition position data. In particular, the "APL Number" and "Category" fields of Section I would be filled. After reviewing Section I of your ACRB, you may have questions or concerns regarding the current acquisition position data as reflected on your ACRB or regarding the appropriateness of identifying your position as A&TWF. You should begin by discussing this with your supervisor. Your supervisor should know which positions have been deemed A&TWF by your organiza-

tion and should be able to assist you in determining if your position has been properly identified and coded. Once you have determined that it would be appropriate to identify your position as A&TWF, you will need to contact the appropriate APL POC for your command or organization if the data in Section I of your ACRB need to be updated. The APL POC would be responsible for using the APL process to correct any errors in your acquisition position data as reflected on your ACRB or to add your position to the A&TWF. You may also consult with your Acquisition Career Manager (ACM) for information regarding the identification of your position as A&TWF. Your ACM is also available to provide you with a myriad of career management information and advice.

*For additional information, visit the Acquisition Support Center Web site (**http://asc.rdaisa.army. mil**).*

FY02 Major Promotion Board Results

The FY02 Major Promotion Board results were released on Sept. 4, 2002. This article analyzes the board results.

Acquisition Corps Results

Board members reviewed the files of 135 Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) officers in the primary zone of consideration for promotion. From this population, the board selected 116 officers. The resulting primary zone selection rate of 85.9 percent is a difference of five fewer officers based on the Army average; however, this is a 4.0 percent increase over last year's rate. There were 35 AAC officers considered for above-the-zone promotion, and the board selected 13, which is a difference of 3 additional officers. The AAC above-the-zone selection rate was 37.1 percent, which is 8.6 percent higher than the Army average of 28.5 percent. In addition, 3 out of 86 officers considered were selected below the zone, which is a difference of 3 fewer officers than the Army average. The below-the-zone selection rate for the AAC was 3.5 percent, and the Army average was 6.7 percent.

Trend For Selectees

Selection to major is primarily a reflection of how an officer performs in his or her basic branch assignments. Most AAC officers have few, if any, Officer Evaluation Reports (OERs) from acquisition assignments when the Major Promotion Board considers them. Many officers are still completing basic branch, Reserve Officer Train-

ing Corps recruiting, and Active or Reserve component assignments, or are attending advanced civil schooling. Therefore, AAC officers are judged against the same criteria as basic branch officers.

Second lieutenant OERs have been purged from officer files and were not reviewed by the promotion board. The most important discriminator continues to be company command OERs, and board members appear to use command reports as the measure of an officer's ability to succeed as a major.

The majority of AAC officers received the new DA Form 67-9 OER for their command time. The new OER eliminates the confusion for the board by clearly communicating the senior rater assessment on above-center-of-mass (ACOM) officers. However, some officers received "one block" command DA Form 67-8 OERs, and the senior rater narrative was extremely important in determining the strength of an OER. Senior rater narratives that quantified an officer's performance sent a clearer picture to the board on the "true block check" (i.e., best officer in a command, top 5 percent, 3 out of 10). Officers with overall COM files and "top block" COM command OERs were at a disadvantage for promotion. Senior rater narratives that focused on the officer's potential seemed generally more effective than OERs focusing on how the officer performed in the job.

Performance in basic branch assignments, especially company command, appeared to be the board's focus. The message is clear: seek company command, do well, and maintain a high level of performance in all other assignments.

The names of the AAC officers selected for promotion to major are shown below. An asterisk indicates a below-the-zone selection.

MAJOR PROMOTION LIST

Aleandre, Rodrigue	Brown, Evan J.
Anderson, Lisa L.	Byers, David B.
Baker, Houston E.	*Calhoun, John C.
Baker, Sherwood P.	Chan, Joseph H.
Barker, Wayne E.	Clomera, Arthur B.
Baynes, Leland R.	Coile, Gregory H.
*Beard, Kirby D.	Collins, Robert M.
Bentzel, Thomas F.	Conaway, Stephen J.
Bledsoe, Elizabeth	Coombs, John L.
Blomquist, Michael	Cude, Clarence C.
Brennan, William T.	Davidson, Paul G.
Brown, Christopher	Davis, Gloria D.

Debany, Richard B.
DeSilva, Roy A.
Devine, Michael J. III
Ellis, Bruce E.
Ellison, Kevin L.
Evans, Jeffrey G.
Evans, Mark M.
Feuerborn, Thomas A.
Finch, Kevin J.
Foster, Michael E.
Fowler, Jonathan L.
Francis, Sabrina E.
Furber, Daniel L.
Gaddy, Roland M.
Gambles, Kenneth L.
Gardunia, Craig R.
Geisbert, Kevin L.
Gill, Americus M.
Greany, Peter N.
Green, Lance B.
Greig, Amanda P.
Greig, Scot W.
Grosenheider, Susan
Grzybowski, Gregory
Hackett, Christine
Hagenston, Marty G.
Hang, Yee C.
Harp, Daryl M.
Harris, Terrece B.
Hatchett, Barry M.
Hawkins, Jon
Heck, Joseph D. Jr.
Henrie, Mark E.
Henthorn, Thomas J. Jr.
Hoffman, Dean M. IV
Hollis, Fredrick C.
Hostetler, Jane M.
Hribar, Robert S.
Hurst, Donald W.
Jackson, William D.
Johnson, Jeffrey H.
Johnson, Mark A.
Jones, Ernest C.
Kerley, Nelson G.
Killen, Bradley J.
Kimball, Charles F.
Kimbley, William F.
King, Federica L.
Landry, Paul D.
Laughlin, Kelly D.
Lauro, Paul M.
Law, Robert N.
Lee, William E.
Ludwig, Eric W.

Lyttle, Brian J.
MacGregor, Lee J.
Mallory, David S.
McGee, Randy E.
McGurk, Michael K.
Miceli, Robert J.
Micklewright, Scott
Middleton, Robert E.
Morgan, David L.
Muhammad, Hakeem A.
Myers, Vernon L.
Ogburn, John D.
Oquendo, Gregory
Overbey, Gerard J.
Padilla, George
Paige, Matthew N.
Pearman, William F.
Pearson, William E. Jr.
Powell, Shawn B.
Rannow, Eric C.
Ransom, Audrey
Ravenell, Craig M.
Roberson, Aaron D.
Roberson, Rochelle
Ryba, Bruce A.
Ryder, Ronald L.
Satterfield, A.
Shea, Thomas E.
Sherrill, Tommie L.
Shuler, Paul D.
Sieber, Anthony
Skinner, James T.
Smallwood, Phillip
Smith, Jesse W.
Sparrow, William E.
Stewart, Joyce B.
Stone, Daniel L.
Tasca, Adam R.
Thomas, Robert J.
*Thompson-Blackwell,
   Rosalyn
Thorne, James M.
Thorpe, Scott N.
Traxler, Michael E.
Vanderschaaf, Reid
VanRiper, Steven G.
Volkin, Ronald S.
Warner, Timothy A.
Warren, Thomas E.
Wilhide, Donald B.
Woodman, Richard F.
Worshim, Charles II

SSC Selection Board Results

Results of the Senior Service College (SSC) Selection Board were released Aug. 7, 2002. The board selected 29 members of the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC) to attend SSC during academic year (AY) 03-04. The AAC had 351 officers eligible for selection, and 29 (8.1 percent) were selected. The overall Army selection rate was 7.8 percent.

Twenty-six of the 29 selectees were former or current product managers (PMs) or acquisition commanders (ACs) (including those on orders to a Command Select List position). One of the officers selected was revalidated from the AY 02-03 list; he is not included in the selection statistics.

This SSC Selection Board was the first one held by career field. AAC officers (Functional Area (FA) 51) and Foreign Area Officers (FA 48) are the only two FAs in the operational support career field. As you will note in the selectee profile, the results from this board were different in some areas than we expected based on historical trends. This year's results do not indicate specific trends because it is the first year the board was held by career field; however, we may see new and different trends develop in the future. Below is an overview of selectee profiles:

• Eighty percent or more of all new Officer Evaluation Reports (OERs) were above-center-of-mass (ACOM).
• Eleven selectees had no PM/AC OERs in their board file.
• Eighteen selectees had at least one PM/AC OER in their board file (last year all selectees had at least one PM/AC OER in their board file).
• Selectees belonged to three primary year groups (YGs): YG82—9 (28.6 percent), YG83—9 (28.6 percent), and YG84—9 (32.1 percent). Last year, officers were primarily selected from YGs 82 and 83.

Each officer selected for attendance at SSC received a letter from the U.S. Total Army Personnel Command's (PERSCOM's) Acquisition Management Branch (AMB) detailing how to access the PERSCOM Officer Career Management Knowledge Center through the Army Knowledge Online Web site. The letter also contained a synopsis of each SSC and available fellowship. Officers will provide their SSC preferences online through the Knowledge Center. Selectees may choose to attend resident SSC, enroll in the Army War College Distance Education Program for AY 03-04, or decline. SSC selectees normally attend the Army War College, the Air War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF), or the Acquisition Fellowship at the University of Texas-Austin (UT-Austin). The latter three choices have limited seats. ICAF and UT-Austin tend to be the two programs for which there are more officers wanting to attend than seats available.

In addition, ICAF has special considerations: officers who are joint Service officers and have been awarded an additional skill identifier of 3L are ineligible to attend, and 50 percent plus one of the attendees (by branch) must be assigned to a joint position immediately following school. Therefore, it is very important that selectees give as much consideration to their second and following choices as they do to their first choice.

The SSC alternate list is not formally published; however, officers selected as alternates usually receive a letter in the December timeframe informing them of their status. AMB will only receive the list of officers who are considered high alternates (those officers who are most likely to be activated to attend SSC). The numbers activated are dependent on approved operational deferments and declinations. AMB does not expect to receive this list until mid-December 2002 or January 2003.

The names of selectees are listed below. An asterisk indicates the revalidated officer. All selectees are lieutenant colonels.

Bryant, Thomas Henry
Burke, Kyle Thomas
Callahan, Michael Owen
Cook, David Alan
Dever, Douglas Allen
Doyle, Norbert
Eberle, Nathan Roy
Ellis, Carl Mason
Hazelwood, Donald
    Alexander
Hollingsworth, Larry Dale
Hoppe, William Charles
Hughes, Daniel Peter
Knudson, Albert
Lamb, William Leetch
Leisenring, Stephen Bryan

Lepine, Paul Raymond
Manning, Barry George
Paquette, Derek Joseph
Parker, William Ernest
Ralph III, James Robert
Rice, David John
*Sears, George Albert
Shiffrin, Scott Erwin
Shipe, Richard Thomas
Shufflebarger, Newman
    Deon
Walters, Stephen
Wassmuth, Richard Joseph
Wheeler, Kenneth Alan
Williamson, Michael Eric
Wolfe, Daniel G.

Army Acquisition Qualification Course Replacing MAM Course

A new course is being created for the Army acquisition workforce. The 8-week Army Acquisition Qualification Course (AAQC) will replace the venerable Materiel Acquisition Management (MAM) Course. Its curriculum will cover requirements determination, program management, acquisition logistics, contracting, materiel testing, software acquisition, and a number of other related functional areas.

Since 1985, the Army has relied on the MAM Course as its primary training course for officers being accessed into the Army Acquisition Corps (AAC). During the 17 years it was offered, the MAM Course provided fundamental acquisition training for thousands of graduates including Army officers, Department of the Army civilians, and allied officers. The 7-week MAM Course provides equivalencies to ACQ 101 and ACQ 201—two Defense Acquisition University (DAU) courses required for several acquisition career fields.

In July 2001, then Director for Acquisition Career Management (DACM) and MAM Course Proponent LTG Paul J. Kern approved a new curriculum for the Army acquisition workforce. In March 2002, LTG John S. Caldwell Jr., the current DACM and MAM Course Proponent, continued the transformation of the MAM Course for the AAC by underscoring the need to have the AAQC be taught at other installations. Both Kern and Caldwell determined that acquisition training for future officers and civilians entering the acquisition workforce should be expanded. This will allow the AAQC to be taught worldwide. The expanded training will better equip officers and civilians to successfully manage the highly complex task of systems acquisition.

Working with the course proponent, officials at the Army Logistics Management College (ALMC) developed a new and challenging curriculum. A cadre of Army officers and civilians will be responsible for creating course materials for this 8-week course. A companion decision to limit the amount of time for this entry-level training course is adding an additional challenge to a complicated task.

Simultaneously, ALMC is establishing a satellite campus at Huntsville, AL. While AAQC will be the centerpiece of the ALMC satellite campus, other ALMC courses will be offered at Huntsville as well.

AAQC will provide equivalencies for a wide range of DAU-sponsored courses. These include:

• Fundamentals of Systems Acquisition Management (ACQ 101),
• Intermediate Systems Acquisition (ACQ 201),
• Basics of Contracting (CON 101),
• Principles of Contract Pricing (CON 104),
• Basic Information Systems Acquisition (IRM 101),
• Acquisition Logistics Fundamentals (LOG 101), and
• Introduction to Acquisition Workforce Test and Evaluation (TST 101).

The first offering of AAQC is scheduled to begin in January 2003. Additional information about AAQC may be found at the following Web site: **http://www.almc. army.mil/AMD/Huntsville/aaqc_homepage.htm**.

The preceding article was written by Joe R. East Jr., who has been designated to head the ALMC-Huntsville, AL, campus and serve as the AAQC Course Director. He is

a graduate of the DSMC Program Management Course and has a B.S. in general business from Mississippi State University and an M.S. in management from the Florida Institute of Technology.

FY03 Army Experimental Test Pilot Board

A U.S. Total Army Personnel Command (PERSCOM) board will convene Feb. 18, 2003, to select those aviators best qualified to participate in the Army Aviation Experimental Test Pilot Training Program. This board will review files and select both commissioned and warrant officers. Commissioned officers selected to attend the U.S. Naval Test Pilot School (USNTPS) are automatically accessed into the Army Acquisition Corps, where they will serve for the remainder of their careers. Warrant officers will continue to be managed by the Warrant Officer Division of PERSCOM.

Applications must include the following:

• Official transcript of college credits,
• A copy of the aviator's most current *Individual Flight Record and Flight Certificate-Army* (DA Form 759),
• Endorsement(s) by an instructor pilot/standardization instructor pilot who will comment on the applicant's flying ability,
• A statement of the applicant's swimming ability, and
• Endorsement from the first field grade officer in the applicant's chain of command.

To be eligible, commissioned officers must meet the following criteria:

• Have at a minimum a bachelor's degree in an engineering discipline or hard science,
• Be in the grade of captain or major,
• Have at least 7 years of active federal service,
• Be basic branch qualified at the company grade level prior to attendance at USNTPS, and
• Have a minimum of 700 hours total flight time (simulator time not included) with at least 500 hours in rotary-wing aircraft.

To be eligible, warrant officers must meet the following criteria:

• Have at a minimum an associate degree with above average grades;
• Have completed college algebra, calculus, and physics (or mechanics) with above average grades;
• Be in the grade of CW2 or higher;
• Have completed military education level for current grade prior to attending the test pilot training program;
• Have at a minimum 1,000 total flight hours (simulator time not included) with at least 700 hours in rotary-wing aircraft; and
• Have sufficient time remaining upon completion of training to complete the Active duty service obligation (ADSO).

For all applicants, highly desirable qualifications are:

• Successful completion of college mechanics (solids, fluid, flight), thermodynamics, aerodynamics, control theory, differential equations, and advanced mathematics, with above average grades;
• Qualification and experience in complex aircraft such as the CH-47, UH-60, AH-64, OH-58D, and/or fixed-wing military aircraft; and
• Rating as an instructor pilot, instrument flight examiner, or maintenance test pilot.

Note that pilot-in-command flight hours are weighted more than co-pilot or pilot flight hours in the selection process.

An individual who is qualified to recommend and endorse an applicant should make a thorough appraisal of that applicant's flying ability, operational experience, motivation, adaptability, and ability to communicate orally and in writing.

All experimental test pilot board applications must be received at PERSCOM no later than Jan. 11, 2003. Commissioned and warrant officer applications should be mailed to Commander, U.S. Total Army Personnel Command, ATTN: TAPC-OPB-E (MAJ Harvey), 200 Stovall Street, Alexandria, VA 22332-0411.

Experimental test pilot utilization assignments will be based on the needs of the Army. Initial tours will be served at the Aviation Technical Test Center, Fort Rucker, AL, or the Aviation Applied Technology Directorate, Fort Eustis, VA. USNTPS graduates will serve as experimental test pilots or in organizational staff positions that directly affect the type, design, and configuration of Army aircraft.

For additional information, please contact MAJ Keith Harvey at (703) 325-3128, DSN 221, or e-mail **keith.harvey@hoffman.army.mil**; or CW3 Kimberly Young at (703) 325-5251, DSN 221, or e-mail **Kimberly.Young@hoffman.army.mil**.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

Board Selects Competitive Development Group

A board convened in August 2002 to select individuals for the Army Acquisition Corps Competitive Development Group (CDG) Year Group (YG) 2003. Fifteen individuals were selected to participate in this 3-year career development program. This is the sixth CDG YG to be chosen—a total of 120 members to date. Each applicant went though a stringent board selection process for the opportunity to be provided expanded leadership and management training and cross-functional experience in various acquisition career fields.

Congratulations to all those selected to this program! Names of selectees and their employing agencies follow.

Garrison, Freida S.	AMCOM
Gomez, Oscar Jose	AMCOM
Herman, Jeffery P.	AMCOM
Hodges, Ancel B.	Army National Guard Bureau
Huhlein, Bradley J.	AMCOM
Ivey, Regina L.	AMCOM
Janisz, Craig S.	STRICOM
Lyle, Morris	AMCOM
Mitchell, George J.	CALL
Nulk, Margaret Z.	PEO, Soldier
Riddick, Robert L.	Objective Force Task Force
Setili, Colleen M.	TACOM
Shields, Joseph R.	DSCS
Szcepanski, Richard M	AMCOM
Willoughby, Michael B	U.S. Army Europe Safety and Occupational Health Office

ACQUISITION EXCELLENCE

STAMIS Keeps Pace With Objective Army

The Army leadership recognizes that transforming today's Army into a more agile, lethal, versatile, and sustainable future force requires time, perhaps 10 to 15 years. During this transition phase, the Legacy Force systems and corresponding legacy Standard Army Management Information System (STAMIS) will require modernizing and upgrading to keep pace with information technology advancements. STAMIS will continue processing critical combat service support (CSS) information well into 2007 and possibly beyond. Many of these aging systems were developed with hardware and software platforms of the 1980s, such as MS-DOS and 8MHz Intel 80286 processors. These legacy STAMIS applications have become unsupportable under their old hardware and software platforms and require a fresh look to extend their life until replaced by newer CSS systems.

The Integration Division within the Operations and Mission Support Directorate of the Program Executive Office, Enterprise Information Systems is providing solutions to extend critical STAMIS life cycles at minimal acquisition cost while also providing enhanced capabilities. Personnel in the Integration Division, in conjunction with software developers at Fort Lee, VA, are transforming the legacy STAMIS to operate with modern hardware and software. The successful fielding of the first upgrade in January 2002 proved that the life of the legacy systems could be extended until the advent of the Global Combat Support System-Army.

This successful January fielding was an upgrade to the Unit Level Logistics System-Ground (ULLS-G), a stand-alone MS-DOS based application that automates unit supply, maintenance, and materiel readiness management operations. ULLS-G software was repackaged to run under the Windows 2000 Professional operating system and given a file transfer protocol capability for data transfer over dial-up or local area network Internet/intranet connections. The application can now run in an MS-DOS virtual machine under Windows 2000. The actual ULLS source code (written in Ada) was unchanged, saving an estimated $2 million to rewrite the system. In addition, the upgrade was completed in 3 months rather than an estimated 9 to 12 months needed to rewrite the system. The benefit of extending the life of ULLS-G is that modern supportable hardware and software can now be used to enhance the CSS capability of the soldier.

The second legacy STAMIS considered for upgrade, the Unit Level Logistics System-Aviation, has recently completed testing with Windows 2000 and is in distribution. The upgrade promises benefits similar to those realized with the ULLS-G upgrade. Savings are estimated at $2 million to rewrite the system; completion is estimated at 6 months rather than 12 to 18 months needed to rewrite the system.

Future candidate logistics systems may include the Unit Level Logistics System-S4 and the Standard Property Book System-Redesign. Personnel in the Integration Division are also working with Fort Lee developers to migrate other types of the legacy STAMIS to Windows 2000 in the near future.

*For additional information, contact Monti Jaggers at (703) 681-7571 or **monteze.jaggers@saalt.army.mil**.*